DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 714 EA 012 844

AUTHOR Peters, Leslie K.
TITLE Pennsylvania School Improvement Program. School Site Case Study: School X.
INSTITUTION Governor's Task Force on Community Schools, Tallahassee, Fla.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 80
CONTRACT 400-76-0094
NOTE 69p.; Some appendixes may be illegible due to broken print of original document. For related documents, see EA 012 835-843 and ED 172 432.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Curriculum Development; Educational Assessment; Junior High Schools; Language Arts; Linking Agents; Middle Schools; Needs Assessment; Program Development; Questionnaires; Reading Programs; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania School Improvement Program

ABSTRACT

The Pennsylvania School Improvement Program (PSIP) was created to assist local schools and school districts in the development of curriculum improvement strategies. The process involves the use of "linkers," curriculum specialists who work with teams from the local level to ascertain needs, then connect the local teams with the research and development agencies that can provide information and resources to help meet those needs. This document describes one rural middle school's experience using PSIP in an effort to improve its reading and language arts program. During the period from late 1978 to spring of 1979, this school went through the program orientation and needs assessment phases of PSIP and began the program selection phase. Materials used in these activities are included in appendixes. (Author/PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189714

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL SITE CASE STUDY

School X

This report was prepared as part of the Research and Development Utilization Program for:

National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20028

EA 012 844

Bureau of Research and Evaluation
Office of Research, Planning and Data Management
Pennsylvania Department of Education

January 1980

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

SCHOOL SITE CASE STUDY
School X

This report was prepared as part of the Research and Development Utilization Program for:

National Institute of Education
1200 19th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20028

The work upon which this report is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 400-76-0094 with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education or the Pennsylvania Department of Education and no official endorsement by those agencies is intended or inferred.

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Project Staff
Jay Smink, *Director*
Peg Stank, *Evaluator*

Report Writer
Leslie K. Peters

Bureau of Research and Evaluation
Office of Research, Planning and Data Management
Pennsylvania Department of Education

AUG 4 1980

PENNSYLVANIA SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

SITE STUDY FOR SCHOOL X

Prepared by
Leslie K. Peters
PSIP Case Study Writer

May 18, 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Part I	The Context	1
A.	The Project	1
	Objectives	1
	Structure and Resources	1
	Strategies and Activities	2
B.	The Site	5
Part II	PSIP Activities at School X	7
A.	Entry/Initiation Phase	7
B.	Needs Identification Phase	10
C.	Selection Phase	14
D.	Implementation Phase	
Part III	General Summary of PSIP Impact	

APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A - School X Data, Student Needs Analysis ...	16
A-1 - Pulse Visit One Report	17
A-2 - General Needs Statement	20
A-3 - Student Needs Assessment Charts	21
Appendix B - School X Data, Program Analysis	24
B-1 - Program Analysis Instruments	25
B-2 - Pulse Visit Two Report, Program Analysis Report	28
B-3 - Needs Summary Chart for School X	42
Appendix C - Selection References	43
C-1 - Selection Criteria for School X.....	44
C-2 - Identified R&D Outcomes for School X	45
C-3 - Descriptions of Identified Outcomes	46

PART I: CONTEXT

A. The Project

The Pennsylvania School Improvement Project: Objectives, Structure, Resources, Strategies and Major Activities

Objectives

In recent years there have been a number of federally stimulated efforts in education directed toward finding solutions to local school problems. The results of these efforts have been the development of research-based programs and techinques, R&D products, as rational approaches to local school problems. The Pennsylvania School Improvement Program, one of seven Research and Development Utilization Projects, is an effective means of obtaining these R&D products and provides a problem-solving process that has been successful in improving basic skills instructional programs. The Pennsylvania School Improvement Program (PSIP) has been an intense management and coordination effort of the Pennsylvania Department of Education for delivering technical assistance to a number of schools through a team of resource persons from three educational research agencies working through and with an Intermediate Unit Linking Agent.

PSIP's objectives are, first, to help schools analyze their needs in the basic skills area and second, to help schools improve student performance in basic skills using the best available instructional programs and techniques produced by research and development activities.

Structure and Resources

The basic structure of PSIP is built upon the concept of an Intermediate Unit Linkage person serving as an educational extension agent who facilitates two-way communication between a local school and sources of R&D outcomes/products. This Linker is supported by a team of persons from the R&D agencies that provides technical assistance to a school site through the Linker. This team is called, for PSIP purposes, a School Assistance Team (SAT). The SAT always includes staff members from one or more of the participating agencies, a person with expertise in the content area of interest to the school site and the IU Linker. The SAT works cooperatively with a Local Action Team (LAT) and selected by the site school to analyze both student and program needs and then to select and to implement an R&D outcome appropriate to these needs.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education is responsible for managing and directing PSIP activities. The participating agencies are described in the following paragraphs.

The Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC). --The mission of the LRDC, part of the University of Pittsburgh, is to develop, study and evaluate adaptative educational environments for schools. LRDC has had experience in instructional design, curriculum anaylsis, policy analysis, teacher education and computer application in education.

Research for Better Schools (RBS). --RBS is a private non-profit educational laboratory established in 1966. Its mission is (1) to research and develop instructional systems and materials to improve educational processes for preschool through adult programs and (2) to assist regional education agencies in preparing and carrying out changes in the educational program.

Research and Information Services for Education (RISE). --RISE operates under the primary sponsorship of the Montogomery County Intermediate Unit in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Education. RISE has broad experience in disseminating information on curriculum research drawn from local, state and national resource.

The Intermediate Units (IUs). --The state's IUs provide consultative, advisory and program services to local schools. An IU coordinator serves as a full-time linkage agent to provide assistance to schools involved in PSIP activities.

Strategies and Activities

There are four major strategies in the PSIP process: (1) Needs Assessment, (2) Knowledge Consolidation, (3) Selection and (4) Implementation. Each of the major processes incorporates planned and structured LAT/SAT workshop-type activities as well as follow-up assistance by the IU linkage person to supplement each major workshop. These sequential interrrelated processes will result in an upgrading of the LAT's skill in the use of needs analysis techniques to improve instruction, in the documentation of priority areas for improving the basic skills program and in SAT technical assistance to the LAT in reviewing and selecting available options and implementing educational changes.

Needs Assessment. --Needs assessment is the first phase of school participation. The LAT works cooperatively with the SAT in a problem-solving process to analyze student needs and program needs. There are three major activities involved in needs assessment. Each major activity requires formal LAT/SAT workshop sessions coordinated by the Linker. The three major activities are described below.

Organizing the Needs Analysis. --This meeting provides the Local Action Team (LAT) with an overview of the needs analysis process, helps them begin to function as a problem-solving team, and focuses on a general area of need for later concentration.

The major objectives are to orient the LAT to the entire needs analysis process and to help the group to function as an effective problem solving team and to develop a general statement of the school needs on the basis of a review of school data. The Research Utilizing Problem-Solving (RUPS) materials are used during this activity. The outcome of the session is the appointment of an LAT coordinator and a general problem statement for the school.

Analyzing Student Needs. --These sessions are designed to identify the discrepancy between desired student performance and current student performance and to prepare a detailed statement of student needs on the basis of that discrepancy. The structured sessions are based on Curriculum and Instruction: Planning Improvement, a handbook developed by RBS. The outcomes of the student needs analysis sessions are: (1) a chart showing desired student performance in a basic skill area, standards for this performance and a description of the target population, (2) a chart showing current student performance in these areas, (3) a discrepancy analysis of these charts and (4) a detailed statement of student needs.

Analyzing Program Needs. --The purpose of this phase is to identify aspects of the current educational program which might be strengthened in order to improve student performance in the defined need area. The materials used for program analysis are: a model of classroom processes developed by research at LRDC, instrumentation based on the variables from this model, and data from other needs analyses activities.

During the program analysis sessions the LAT is provided with an overview of the factors which R&D suggest relate to student performance. The LAT then decides which of these variables should be investigated. Instruments are constructed and data are collected by the LAT and the Linker. The SAT analyzes the data and submits a summary of the findings to the LAT for consideration in producing a statement of program needs.

Knowledge Consolidation. --This phase consists of an Outcome Search and a comprehensive Literature Search on what research and development says about (1) basic skills learning and instructional theory and general learning theory, (2) principles of diffusion and dissemination activities, and (3) school organization and curriculum development processes. The Outcome Search identifies effective educational practices in basic skills instruction, screens the educational practices for validity and availability and analyzes them using criteria developed by the LAT during the needs definition phase. A bank of appropriate, usable alternative practices for basic skills instruction is then submitted to the LAT for consideration.

The Knowledge Consolidation activities are initiated as soon as the LAT generates a general problem statement at the first needs assessment session. Data is entered into Knowledge Consolidation as it is generated by the LAT.

The Selection Process. --During the selection process the LAT develops selection criteria related to local school conditions, screens possible educational practices using these standards, selects the practice that best meets the standards and produces a general plan for implementing the educational practice selected. During this activity the LAT is first presented with a set of R&D outcomes selected by the Knowledge Consolidation component using the data generated by the student needs analysis and the program analysis activities. These R&D alternatives are reviewed and screened by the LAT using site-specific criteria. There are two or three elimination rounds to the process. The outcome is the selection of some R&D product/process for implementation.

The Implementation Process. --The LAT and SAT work together to develop a realistic plan for implementing a change in the school curriculum. Staff members are trained, and the new instructional process becomes operative. The SAT provides technical assistance to the LAT in evaluating the effectiveness of the new procedures and assists in modifications when necessary.

B. The Site

General Background of PSIP School X

PSIP School X is a middle school located in a borough of Pennsylvania having a population of 7,600. The community is within nine miles of the county seat and a larger city athmosphere, but the community residents are rather conservative, based on the rural and religious make-up of the area.

Despite a number of industrial concerns in and around the borough, agriculture and livestock still make an important contribution to the economy of the surrounding area. In recent years, tourism has assumed an increasingly important role in the economy and this trend is expected to continue in the future.

The school district has a student population of 3,350 and a professional staff of 1,777. School taxes have been raised in the last two years. In recent years, this district has been involved in serious staff/district office conflict. District wide staff and community dissatisfaction with the former superintendent served as a catalyst for a teacher strike. Respondents reported that in the past neither staff, community, or school board members had sufficent imput into the school organization and decision making. The former superintendent resigned in 1977, and the present superintendent has been well received by the staff and community. Teacher moral has increased. The present superintendent was initially responsible for PSIP involvement at School X. The central office is interested in the school site.

School X, a grade 6-8 middle school, opened in 1971. The principal has been at the middle school since the opening and previously served as an elementary principal in the district. The majority of the staff at the middle school report that most of their teaching experience has been within the district. The staff consists of a combination of elementary and secondary level teachers with a wide difference in teaching philosophy and strategies.

Teachers report that when School X opened there was a great deal of flexibility in the school schedule which allowed for a considerable amount of academic freedom. Teachers from both the elementary and secondary levels shared ideas. In the past few years, there has been a gradual move away from this open situation to a more structured secondary orientation toward teaching and students.

The building principal stated that a cut in staff and budget resulted in the return to a more traditional textbook orientated instructional program. Other respondents felt that organizational structure was a direct result of the leadership style of the principal. They describe his leadership style as authoritative and dictatorial.

From all the data available to the PSIP team, it appeared that the staff at School X was aware of a problem and the need for a change in the organization of instruction. The problem area of Reanging/Language Arts was selected as a focal point for curriculum improvement.

PSIP ACTIVITIES AT SCHOOL X

A. Entry/Initiation Phase

There are three major activities during the PSIP Entry Initiation Phase. First, a general overview meeting of the central office administrative teams from all of the participating school districts is held at the intermediate unit office. An orientation session is then presented by the PSIP team at the school site for the entire faculty. The site orientation session is followed by an on-site visit by the PSIP School Assistance Team (SAT) to gather information about the general climate of each school. This on-site visit is called a Pulse Session and the SAT virtually does "take the pulse" of the school.

General Overview Meeting

A general overview of PSIP was presented to the central office administrative team of School District B. The purpose of this meeting was to present a brief summary of the kinds of information generated by PSIP process, possible pay-off for the participating school, and to allow the school district administrative team to consider all of the ramification of PSIP participation. Following the first general overview session, the district superintendent communicated with the principal at School X relative to PSIP participation at the site. School X in District B agreed to participate in PSIP.

On-Site Orientation Session

The general overview session was followed on November 8, 1978 by an On-Site Orientation Session at School X for the total faculty. The IU linkage person (hereafter referred to as the Linker) provided a description of the PSIP process to familiarize the staff with all phases of PSIP and to alert the teachers to the responsibilities of a Local Action Team (LAT). A detailed description of each major PSIP activity was presented by the Linker. The presentation included illustrations of the products generated by a school team as a result of PSIP involvement. The pay-off of instructional improvement was stressed. This On-Site Orientation session provided the Linker with an opportunity to establish rapport with the significant staff persons at the site level.

Linker Follow-up--Pre-Pulse Visit Activities

Following the On-Site Orientation, the Linker met with the principal at School X to discuss the selection of a Local Action Team (LAT) and the area of basic skill to be addressed during PSIP involvement. The Linker was responsible for collecting existing student test data relative to the curriculum area to be studied and for developing an information profile of the district and site school.

The principal identified the problem area of Reading/Language Arts as the area to be addressed. The staff at School X had recently been involved in writing a Reading/Language Arts curriculum and the principal was hopeful that PSIP could offer some additional outside assistance for implementing a change in this curriculum area.

The LAT members were selected by the building principal. LAT membership included: the Reading Coordinator for the district, the building principal, three teacher from the Reading/Language Arts staff at School X, and the school guidance counselor.

The Pulse Session

The Pulse Session, an on-site visit of the SAT, took place on November 16, 1978. The SAT was made up of the IU Linker, two additional IU staff persons with expertise in Reading/Language Arts, PSIP Project Director and the PSIP Evaluator. The Linker provided the SAT with a summary of school profile data. A set of questions were used to provide a common frame of reference for the Pulse Visit. These questions were developed relative to a specific set of constructs abstracted from the Cooley-Lohnes Model of Classroom Processes. The SAT members interviewed the staff during free periods and observed both reading and language arts classes. The SAT impressions of the Reading/Language Arts curriculum from the Pulse Visit are summarized below within the Cooley-Lohnes constructs of Opportunity, Motivation, Structure/Placement, and Instructional Events.

Summary of Team Impressions from PSIP School X Pulse Visit One

Opportunity - Motivation -- The students are grouped homogeneously. The classes observed averaged thirty students and were fifty minutes in length. Classroom instruction was primarily teacher directed total group. Instruction was directed to the average ability student. There was no evidence of small group instruction or individualization, with the exception of the resource room, which is highly individualized, Students are assigned to the resource room to remediate a deficiency in reading and/or math.

There was little evidence of the use of supplementary materials or visual stimulation in the classroom. Although the library was well supplied with materials, it was not being well utilized by the students. The teachers indicated that they were confined to a very structured school schedule which limited the time students could use the library.

Student behavior was not viewed as a problem. Students attended to the tasks at hand and had a good feel for the rules of the classroom and the expectations of the school. Therefore, more time is spent on instruction than on managerial duties.

Structure/Placement--Classes are grouped homogeneously and this grouping is the main focus for the content material presented. Standardized test data indicates that the students at School X are above the grade level of expected achievement. The problem is one of how the students are or are not applying these skills. Little is being done with the data on students' standardized test scores relative to instruction. The same basel materials are used for all students and appear to be the primary materials available for instruction. The basel system, MacMillian Reading Series and the Warringer Handbook for Grammer, provide a structured sequential program. However, the material is heavily loaded in the cognitive area.

Instructional Events--Instructional events are highly structured and teacher directed. There is little opportunity for peer interaction or student initiated learning activities. Teachers are concerned with the lack of opportunity for small group instruction. They expressed an interest in exploring ways of managing the classroom and planning instruction to meet the needs of their students.

General Comments on Reading/Language Arts

B. Needs Identification Phase

There are three major activities in the Needs Identification Phase of PSIP: (1) Introduction to Needs Identification, (2) Student Needs Analysis and (3) Program Analysis. Each major activity has a specific payoff that relates to the PSIP Knowledge Consolidation and PSIP Selection of Outcomes processes. The Introduction to Needs Analysis provides a general statement of a specific problem area; this problem statement provides the PSIP agencies involved in the Knowledge Consolidation processes with data necessary to initiate a definition of criteria relative to the site's specific area of concern. The Student Needs Analysis activities result in a detailed definition of the areas of need for a specific student population within a basic skills curriculum. Again, the Knowledge Consolidation unit uses this Student Needs Definition to further refine the pool of possible R&D outcomes applicable to the problem identified by the site. The Program Analysis provides an indepth description of the current school curricula in a selected skills area. This detailed description also contributes to the criteria used by the Knowledge Consolidation component to identify an appropriate listing or catalog of R&D outcomes to be submitted to the LAT during Selection phase of PSIP.

Introduction to Needs Analysis

The first major PSIP activity scheduled for the LAT took place at School X on December 7, 1978. Substitute teachers were provided for those members of the LAT who are classroom teachers. The Linker provided the leadership during this session with assistance from the PSIP Director and the PSIP Evaluator.

The PSIP Director provided the LAT with a general overview of PSIP objectives and purposes and a review of the needs analysis activities. The PSIP Evaluator assisted the Linker in reporting school data from EQA (Pennsylvania State Assessment Program) and the school's testing program. The Linker was responsible for presenting a summary report on the SAT Pulse Visit.

During the report of the Pulse Visit, various LAT members reacted to the needs cited. The principal, Mr. H, mentioned the need for inservice for teachers to learn how to use small group instruction. Ms. W, the LAT coordinator, agreed. "A lot of us need inservice for small group instruction. Perhaps that is why more of us don't use it."

Most of the discussion centered on the organizational structure of the school. Several LAT members felt that there was too much emphasis placed on accountability and testing and not enough emphasis on creativity, teacher communication and common planning time.

Discussion developed concerning the use of the resource room at the school. The resource room is used to remediate student deficiency in reading or math. The student is removed from the regular developmental classroom program in order to make use of the resource room. Suggestion was made to restructure the resource room program to provide follow-up activities to the regular classroom program.

Mr. H, the principal, mentioned the need for an additional teacher to head this program. Presently, the room is run by a "Ceta " funded employee. "Perhaps through PSIP we can draw some attention to the need for a certificated teacher for the resource room."

The session continued with the Linker's report of school data from EQA and from the schools' testing program. It was evident from the data presented that the students at School X tested well and that the problem was not one of improving test score, but of increasing student interest and teacher communication. See Pulse Visit One Report in Appendix A-1.

Following the LAT/SAT interaction, the agenda called for the LAT to participate in a simulation activity based on the RUPS process. This simulation activity is expected to develop communication skills within the LAT and provide a model that the LAT can use in writing their own Needs Statement. The RUPS activity was successful and the LAT was able to generate some appropriate statements. These statements were later developed into one General Needs Statement for School X. (Appendix A-2)

Linker Follow-Up

The Linker, PSIP Evaluator, and the LAT coordinator met in early January, 1979 to develop the final version of the General Needs Statement and plan strategies for student needs assessment. Student Needs Assessment Charts were developed for grades six, seven, and eight. These charts described current and desired student performance, along with discrepancies in student performance. The completed charts are found in Appendix A-3.

Pulse Visit Two

The SAT make a two day Pulse Visit at School X on February 14 and 15, 1979. This second Pulse Visit was based upon the specific problem areas identifies in the General Needs Statement. Members of the SAT were provided with a common set of data collection instruments for use in on-site interviews and classroom observations. Appendix B-1.

LAT/SAT Session Two - Program Analysis Report

The second LAT/SAT session was held at School X on March 12, 1979. The purpose of this session was to present to the LAT the results of the questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations conducted by the SAT during the Pulse Visit Two.

The PSIP Evaluator presented a summary of the model of influences that contribute to student achievement. The Linker provided the LAT with a report on the data collected during the Pulse Visit Two. This report summarized the data into sections based upon the Cooley Lohnes constructs of Opportunity, Motivation, Structure, and Instructional Events. This report can be found in Appendix B-2.

During the reveiw of the Pulse Visit Two Report, the LAT was given the opportunity to comment on the SAT findings. Although the LAT seemed to agree with the findings of the report, Mr. H appeared quite withdrawn. He was non-committal and passive. During lunch, an LAT member reported to the case study writer that the superintendent had asked Mr. H to assume an elementary principalship in the district for the next school year. It appeared that this change in leadership had altered Mr. H's motive for PSIP involvement.

The session continued, and time was given for the LAT to review the program analyses data, generate imput for completing a Needs Summary Chart, and prioritize program needs. The Needs Summary Chart is found in Appendix B-3.

The results of the priority needs were listed and the LAT determined the areas they would handle internally and those requiring PSIP assistance. These needs are listed below:

	Needs	
1.	Management system for Reading/ Language Arts for School X	PSIP
2.	Experience in application of Language Arts skills	PSIP
3.	Defining supplementary materials	PSIP
4.	Help with regrouping	Internal
5.	Information on communication descriptive literature summary	PSIP
6.	More effective use of IMC	Internal and PSIP

The LAT agreed that the program need definition should include a management system for planning, instruction, and evaluation of the Reading/Language Arts program for School X. This system should provide a balance between Reading and Language Arts with a focus on the application of language arts skills, and provide suggestions for the use of supplementary materials.

This information; Program Needs Definition, Needs Summary Chart, General Needs Statement, and Pulse Visit One and Two Summaries were forwarded to RISE for use in Search activities.

C. Selection Phase

The third LAT/SAT session was held at School x on March 12, 1979. The SAT consisted of PSIP Evaluator and Mr. J from RISE. All LAT members were present at this session.

Mr. J from RISE began the session with a brief overview of the selection phase and a review of the R&D outcome pool. The overview included some current and background information about the National Diffusion Network, Right To Read, and the National Institute of Education.

Mr. J provided the LAT with handouts relative to their identified program needs. He reviewed the "Establishment of Ground Rules", stressing the importance of procedures to (a) reach consensus, (B) to limit discussion, (c) to involve others if they are to be affected by the group's decision, (d) to determine the division of labor, (e) to communicate within and outside the group, (f) to alter ground rules if it becomes necessary. The LAT agreed on ground rules and decided that although they would make recommendations, the total staff would made the final decision.

The session continued and Mr. J introduced "Identification and Determination of Criteria for Selection". The LAT was asked to work in small groups to select the criteria and then combine their lists. The LAT's completed list of selection criteria is found in Appendix C-1.

The LAT members were given a list of twelve outcomes selected by RISE on the basis of the LAT generated data, along with a description of each of the twelve outcomes.. The LAT spent the balance of the session screening these outcomes in terms of their criteria. (Appendix C-2)

At the conclusion of this session, the LAT had determined the following: (1) to eliminate five programs that did not meet their criteria, (2) to go ahead with the selection of Individualized Language Arts as an extra program, on their own (3) to request and share additional information with the total staff on the outcomes of Reading/English Project, Teams-Games- Tournament, and Positive Attitudes Toward Learning. If these outcomes are supported by the staff, the LAT plans to do some on-site visits for additional imput to selection.

At this point, all the programs being considered by the LAT at School X reflect their need for a managment system. The LAT coordinator plans to present the programs and LAT selection criteria to the total staff for their reactions. Plans for the next session include final selection and plans for implementation.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL X DATA

STUDENT NEEDS ANALYSIS

Appendix A-1

VISITATION SUMMARY

Pulse Visit One Report

General Classroom Environment

1. The students were grouped homogeneously and the average class size was around 30 students. Classes were 50 minutes in length. Activities varied in time.

2. The instruction was directed toward the large group and was teacher centered. Question and answer.

3. The students seemed to understand the classroom rules and were functioning within the rules framework.

4. There was no evidence of small group, individualized or independent work. The resource room was highly individualized and skill centered.

5. Many classrooms had limited visual stimulation.

6. The materials used in the classrooms were commercially produced.

7. There was little evidence of teacher made or pupil made materials.

8. There was little evidence of supplementary material in the classroom - either commercial or teacher made. There were very few classroom dictionaries, thesaurus, mazagines, paperback books, newspapers.

Structure and Placement

The curriculum was specified and sequenced. There did not seem to be provisions for watching pupil skills with appropriate content. The homogeneous grouping seems to have been the major focus for appropriateness. Specific objectives for lessons were not clear. Teacher-made quizzes and student oral response were used to monitor student progress.

Opportunity

The classes were teacher directed through question and answer. There was little evidence of independent or individualized work. There was little peer interaction, or small group activity. A basal series by MacMillan Company was used at each grade. Several novels are read at the 7th & 8th grade levels. Tom Sawyer was read to one 7th grade class. The Warringer Handbook is used for grammar. Supplementary materials, either commercial or teacher-made, were not utilized. The vast majority of students seemed to attend well during the instructional period.

Motivation

The basal materials in reading seemed to be interesting to the students. The series provided short stories, poems, plays and other readings. In addition, there were several novels and an anthology available. There were no paperbacks, magazines, newspapers or other printed material available. In addition, there were no skill kits or remedial material in the classrooms. The resource room was well supplied with these materials. Teachers' responses were timely and most comments from the teachers were positive and reinforcing. The rapport between teachers and faculty was good; however, the behavior of both teachers

and students seemed to lack enthusiasm or excitement. There were some displays related to reading and language arts; however, there seemed to be little evidence of learning stations, hands-on activities, student work, or student projects or a system of class folders for management. The library seemed to be under-utilized by the student population. Several classes worked for a period in the library, but the purpose was not clear.

Comments from Interviews

1. Warwick Middle Schools has a good student population and a good staff.
2. The resource room has excellent potential for working with some remedial problems.
3. The staff is observed six times by different individuals - principal, assistant principal and department chairpersons; however, not much help comes from the process.
4. The school is not as innovative presently as it was when it opened.
5. Student population generally is not highly motivated.
6. General lack of supplementary material.
7. Testing program is used for broad grouping purposes.
8. There is too much content to be covered.
9. Some classes are too large.
10. The bi-weekly meetings with counselors are useful.
11. There is a lack of communication within the language arts staff and between language arts and other departments.
12. Lower level students are not being helped in regular classroom.
13. The library is not used very well. It should be the center of the school program.
14. It could be that we are too content oriented. Need more concern with students and skills.

1976

E.Q.A.

I.	Self Esteem	48% tile
II.	Understanding Others	19% tile
III.	Verbal	77% tile
	Math	95% tile
IV.	Interest In School	5% tile (below prediction band)
IX.	Appreciating Human Accomplishments	97% tile

Teachers N = 37	Not Used	Each Mo.	Each Wk.	Each Day
1. Pupil Participation in Lesson Planning	42%	36%	9%	12%
Pupil Participation in Classroom Teaching	21%	52%	18%	9%
Role Play	39%	48%	6%	0%
Games	9%	48%	36%	6%
Pupil Eval. of Classroom Climate	61%	36%	0%	3%
Pupil Participation in Dev. Class Roles	48%	45%	6%	0%
Joint Lesson Planning with one or more	64%	30%	3%	0%

2. Classes are too large for effective teaching - 77%
3. Too much time spent on discipline - 49%
4. Students aren't interested in learning - 49%
5. Lack of effective leadership from school administration - 60%
6. Parents don't take enough interest in child's work - 51%

Students (278)

1. How often library used.....Often as needed - 46%
   Frequently, but not enough - 26%
   Only two or three days - 17%
   When classes scheduled - 8%
   No library - 4%

Appendix A-2

General Needs Statement for School X

The Language Arts Program at School X needs to improve student involvement in class activities and to improve student interest in learning, especially with non-academic students.

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT CHART

CONTENT AREA AND STUDENT BEHAVIORS grade 6	MEASURES OF STUDENT BEHAVIORS	DESIRED STANDARD FOR STUDENT SUCCESS	CURRENT STANDARD OF STUDENT SUCCESS	DISCREPANCY
Apply reading skills to school work and practical life situations in and out of school (esp. with non-academic students)	teacher reactions, other subject teachers, test	90% of students able to apply reading skills to all areas	75% of students able to apply reading skills to all areas	15%
Understand the structure of the English sentence (esp. non-academic students)	teacher reactions, test results, student compositions	90% of all students understand the basic structure of the English sentence	80% understand the basic structure of the English sentence	10%
Write 4 kinds of sentences with correct end punctuation	teacher reactions, student papers	95% of all students able to write 4 kinds of sentences with correct end punctuation	80% are able to write 4 kinds of sentences with correct end punctuation	15%

Appendix A-2
Student Needs Assessment

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT CHART

CONTENT AREA AND STUDENT BEHAVIORS grade 7	MEASURES OF STUDENT BEHAVIORS	DESIRED STANDARD FOR STUDENT SUCCESS	CURRENT STANDARD OF STUDENT SUCCESS	DISCREP-ANCY
Understand the structure of the English sentence according to use and form (esp. non-academic students)	teacher reactions, tests	95% of all students understand the structure of the English sentence according to use and form	80% of all students understand the structure of the English sentence according to use and form	15%
Begin arranging complete sentences in paragraph form	teacher reactions, student compositions	90% of all students begin arranging complete sentences in paragraph form	80% of all students begin arranging complete sentences in paragraph form	10%
Identify parts of speech (non-academic students) and rules of capitalization and word usage	teacher reactions, tests	90% of non-academic students identify parts of speech	70% of non-academic students identify parts of speech	20%

Appendix A-3 continued

STUDENT NEEDS ASSESSMENT CHART

CONTENT AREA AND STUDENT BEHAVIORS grade 8	MEASURES OF STUDENT BEHAVIORS	DESIRED STANDARD FOR STUDENT SUCCESS	CURRENT STANDARD OF STUDENT SUCCESS	DISCREP-ANCY
Write paragraphs using introductory topic sentences with supporting details, reasons, or incidents	teacher reactions, student papers	80% of all students able to write paragraphs using introductory topic sentences with supporting details, reasons, or incidents	70% are able to write these paragraphs	10%
Write main ideas with supporting details (non-academic students)	teacher reactions, student papers	90% of non-academic students able to write main ideas with supporting details	70% of non-academic students able to write main ideas with supporting details	20%
Recognize complete sentences, fragments, and run-ons (non-academic students)	teacher reactions, student papers	90% of non-academic students able to recognize complete sentences, fragments, and run ons	70% of non-academic students able to recognize complete sentences, fragments, and run ons	20%
Identify parts of speech, use punctuation and capitalization accurately	teacher reactions, tests, student papers	85% of all students able to identify parts of speech and use punctuation and capitalization accurately	70% of all students able to do these skills	15%

Appendix A-3 continued

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL X DATA

PROGRAM ANALYSES

OBSERVER _____

DATE ---(_____

TEACHER'S NAME _____

CO(IT AREA _____

NUMBER OF STUDENTS _____

TIME _____ to _____

I. STRUCTURE

	Yes	No
1. Objectives made clear to students	12	7
2. Presentation matches objectives	12	7
3. Presentation altered by class feedback	2	18
4. Teacher assesses student mastery	9	10
5. Individual needs met	1	16
6. Tasks based on a) teacher choice, b) student choice	23	0
7. Learning materials based on a) teacher choice, b) student choice	23	1

II. INSTRUCTIONAL EVENTS

1. Teacher explanation clear	14	6
2. Presentation shows evidence of planning	19	3
3. Learning process based on: a) cognitive outcome b) affective outcome	a. 20	b. 3
4. Teacher has command of content	14	7
5. Use of small group instruction	___	22
6. Use of large group instruction	22	___

(Check (✓) appropriate responses)

- Materials are: commercial 13; teacher-made 7; pupil-made 2; manipulative ___; textbooks 19; workbooks/dittoes 7.
- Purpose of lesson: build skills 21; build concepts 2.
- Emphasis was on: direct recall of facts 15; application/transfer of knowledge 9; analysis of information ___.

III. OPPORTUNITY (All percentages are observer estimates)

1. Percentage of time spent in teacher-directed instruction.	100	90	80	70	60	
	N. 9	3	5	2		
2. Percentage of time spent in independent student work.	0	10	20	30	40	
	11	1	6	2	1	
3. Percentage of time that a majority of students were actively involved in a learning activity.	0-20	100	90	80	70	60
	6	1	4	5	1	4
4. Percentage of time spent in disciplinary activity.	0-5	10	15	20	40	50
	12	2	5	2	3	1
5. Percentage of time spent in classroom management activities.	0-5	10	15	50	50	
	12	2	2	5		

IV. MOTIVATION

	Yes	No
1. Materials attractive to students	10	9
2. Teacher provides clear and timely feedback	13	6
3. Teachers comments positive rather than negative	14	6
4. Teacher seems enthusiastic	12	5
5. Displays in room related to content	10	10
6. Student work displayed	9	11
7. Effort rewarded; accurate reasoning rewarded	12	6
8. Varied resources available in classroom	6	14
9. Resource materials were available and used by students	6	5

Appendix B-1

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

Item 59

59. Listed below are some possible topics for inservice programs or workshops. Which ones would be most useful to you in your teaching of language arts? (Put an X in the circle of your choice for each topic.)

	Not useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. Use and interpretation of standardized test results to plan teaching.....	(1) 2	(2) 2	(3) 1
b. Diagnosis and remediation of specific spelling problems.....	(1) 0	(2) 4	(3) 2
c. Diagnosis and remediation of specific writing problems.....	(1) 0	(2) 3	(3) 3
d. How to integrate existing supplementary materials into your curriculum and how to manage their use in the classroom....	(1) 1	(2) 3	(3) 2
e. Integrating your reading and language arts programs.....	(1) 0	(2) 5	(3) 0
f. How to manage small group instruction...	(1) 0	(2) 2	(3) 3
g. How to individualize instruction.....	(1) 0	(2) 4	(3) 2
h. Multimedia approaches to teaching language arts.....	(1) 0	(2) 3	(3) 3
i. Content review of materials and organization of different spelling programs.....	(1) 0	(2) 5	(3) 0
j. Content review of materials and organization of different grammar programs.....	(1) 0	(2) 4	(3) 2
k. Methods of teaching language arts in other content areas.....	(1) 0	(2) 5	(3) 0
l. Content review of materials and organization of different composition programs...	(1) 0	(2) 3	(3) 3
m. Teaching techniques in composition.....	(1) 0	(2) 0	(3) 5
n. Teaching techniques in spelling.....	(1) 1	(2) 3	(3) 2
o. Teaching techniques in grammar.....	(1) 1	(2) 1	(3) 4
p. Teaching techniques in speech.....	(1) 0	(2) 2	(3) 1
q. Other - Specify BEST TECHNIQUES TO USE WITH SLOW LEARNERS	(1)	(2)	(3) 1

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS

37. Listed below are some possible topics for inservice programs or workshops. Which ones would be most useful to you in your teaching of reading? (Put an X in the circle of your choice for each topic.)

	Not Useful	Useful	Very Useful
a. Use and interpretation of standardized test results to plan teaching	(1) 1	(2) 2	(3) 1
b. Diagnosis of specific reading problems	(1) 1	(2) 4	(3) 0
c. Remediation of specific reading problems	(1) 1	(2) 4	(3) 0
d. Content review of material and organization of basal series	(1) 1	(2) 2	(3) 1
e. How to integrate existing supplementary materials into your curriculum and how to manage their use in the classroom	(1) 0	(2) 3	(3) 1
f. PA comprehensive reading plan	(1) 1	(2) 3	(3) 0
g. Reading research findings	(1) 1	(2) 2	(3) 2
h. How to manage small group instruction	(1) 0	(2) 3	(3) 2
i. How to individualize instruction	(1) 0	(2) 2	(3) 3
j. Comprehension	(1) 1	(2) 2	(3) 1
k. Study skills	(1) 1	(2) 1	(3) 2
l. Methods of teaching reading in the content areas	(1) 1	(2) 1	(3) 3
m. Children's literature	(1) 1	(2) 2	(3) 1
n. Reading parent involvement program	(1) 1	(2) 2	(3) 1
o. Other - specify _____	(1)	(2)	(3) 27

INTRODUCTION

This report is divided into sections based upon the Cooley Lohnes classroom variables, Opportunity, Motivation, Structure and Instructional Events. The data is the result of classroom observations (24), teacher interviews (10) and questionnaires (11).

When the data was tallied and summarized, it was apparent that there was little difference in how teachers responded to the variables across grade levels. However, we did separate the data according to Language Arts and Reading. Grades 6, 7 and 8 in both Language Arts and Reading were included in the study. The report contains some summary statements; however, it was my intent that the local committee make major summary statements concerning the data and draw conclusions for the next step in the P.S.I.P. process.

Questionnaires

The following percentages represent an average amount of teacher directed group activity in content areas each day. Spelling 25% -- Grammar 57% -- Composition 10% -- Speech 8%. All Language Arts teachers reported that they assign homework and that the assignment is usually incomplete classwork. The assigned seatwork in class is usually grammar and composition. The teachers were unable to give time estimates on how much time is used for assigned seatwork in the content areas.

The Language Arts program in the Middle School uses Silver Burdett and word lists from the curriculum guide for Spelling. Warriner and A.B.C. are used for Grammar. Composition and Speech units come from the curriculum guide and units from the texts. In addition to the texts, it was reported teachers use other commercial and teacher-made work sheets, especially in Spelling and Grammar.

All teachers reported they covered all Spelling units recommended in the curriculum guide. Forty percent (40%) of the teachers covered the Grammar units recommended by the guide while sixty percent (60%) did not report on the item. None of the teachers reported on composition or speech. All teachers indicated that their students write a composition, read the composition aloud, or make a speech once a week or less.

Observation

A large percentage of instructional time is teacher directed and a majority of the students attend well. Some instructional time is lost due to management functions and disciplinary interruptions; but this does not seem to be a major problem in the majority of Language Arts classes. Interaction between student and teacher is mainly question and answer. This interaction

seems to focus on factual recall in single word or short sentence form. Interaction between students is quite limited.

Interviews

The students in Language Arts classes are homogeneously grouped by the office on the basis of test scores on Standardized tests. The teachers indicated that there is no sub-grouping or individualization in the classroom. Students receive little special help with the exception of the resource room. The basic texts are supplemented with workbooks, dittos and suggested resources from the curriculum guide.

All of the Language Arts teachers (5) reported that literature is not part of their instructional program and therefore students have a very limited opportunity to hear, read, enact or respond to literature in Language Arts classrooms. In addition, there is no opportunity for affective responses to literal and inferential meaning or evaluation of literature. The five teachers reported that their students write once a week or less and that students rarely read their compositions to the class.

This information would suggest that there is not an integrated language arts program which focuses on reading, writing, speaking and listening. The Language Arts teachers teach grammar, spelling and writing in isolation. Also this data, as well as data from Reading teachers, would suggest that reading is, in essence, literature in the Warwick District.

Questionnaires

Five reading teachers indicated that interruptions (outside classroom) are minimal (less than 3 times a week). Forty percent (40%) of the teachers report that students have less than 35 minutes teacher-directed group reading and forty percent (40%) indicated more than 35 minutes and twenty percent (20%) reported 35 minutes. Importantly, those teachers reporting more than 35 minutes reported the entire 48 minute period. Based on this information, a reasonable estimate of time in which a Warwick student spends in a teacher-directed reading activity is 35 minutes a day or about seventy five percent (75%) of the time. All teachers indicated that seat work is reading related.

Observation

Classroom visitations showed a high degree of teacher-directed instruction with seat work related to reading. Students generally attend well (task focus); however, there are several classes, both high and low groups, who do not spend much time on task. Most questioning was geared to single word responses and most classes have limited interaction between students.

Interviews

The primary texts utilized in Reading at Warwick Middle are published by Scott Foresman and MacMillan. All of the reading teachers used these basic texts with very little use of supplementary materials. All classes were homogeneously grouped (administratively) and there was no sub-grouping or individualization. Eighty percent (80%) of the teachers indicated a very limited opportunity for students to respond (write, dramatize, role play, etc.) to reading selections.

Questionnaires

Eighty percent (80%) of the language arts teachers indicated that student assignments involve the use of texts at least three (3) or more times a week. Most other materials (tapes, films, games & puzzles, etc.) are used less than three times a week. All of the teachers (5) indicated that feedback to students on spelling exercises, and tests, grammar exercises and tests is usually within a day. Feedback on compositions is provided within a week. Sixty percent (60%) give feedback on speeches within a week while forty percent (40%) give immediate feedback to the students on speeches. All teachers (5) reported they give positive and negative reinforcement for both behavior and academic performance.

The interest level of spelling and grammar materials was reported as just ok or uninteresting by all teachers. Supplementary materials were reported to be ok or interesting by all teachers; however, teachers indicated supplementary materials were not abundant.

Observation

There does not seem to be a variety of resources in the rooms and as a result there is little use of resource material by teachers or students. Some teachers seem to have difficulty maintaining enthusiasm in their classrooms. Generally, the content in Language Arts classrooms is not thought provoking, challenging or of high interest. Much content is presented in isolation and perhaps does not lead to integration of practical skills or usage. For example, grammar seems to be an end product rather than a means to an end.

Interviews

All five teachers expressed a concern for the lower groups in turns of materials, methods, skills and management. The materials for the advanced groups were judged suitable; but, the materials and content for average and below average

students were deemed inappropriate and uninteresting. In spite of these difficulties, the teachers report that student interest in learning is moderate to high. The student interest in writing and speech was reported as moderate to high while student interest in grammar was reported as low to moderate.

Questionnaires

Eighty percent (80%) of the teachers indicated that they utilize basal textbooks and/or workbooks three or more times a week. Eighty percent (80%) of these teachers also report the use of other types of material (films, tapes, games, puzzles, etc.) less than once a week. One teacher reported a reversal of the above usage.

Feedback to students on completed assignments is usually given within 24 hours of completion and all teachers reported that students generally do not correct their own work. All teachers reported using both positive and negative reinforcement for student academic work and classroom behavior. One teacher indicated the use of detention as a negative reinforcement.

Observation

Generally, classroom resources, other than text and worksheets, were very limited or nonexistent. Tests and grades are used as a major motivator in the majority of the classes. In some instances, content seemed inappropriate (Tom Sawyer) or the content was not challenging or thought provoking. Observations indicated a heavy concentration on factual information with little integration of skill areas.

Interviews

Eighty percent (80%) of the reading teachers reported that there was no classroom library and that the IMC was inadequate. All of the reading teachers indicated that students have a very limited opportunity to select reading material or participate in sustained silent reading.

Structure

Language Arts 6 - 7 - 8

Questionnaires

All teachers (5) reported that they utilize the curriculum guide, basic text and their own work for planning instruction and selecting objectives in the areas of Spelling, Grammar, Composition and Speech. The students are made aware of the objectives in each area. Eighty percent (80%) of the teachers report they do not add or delete objectives in the Grammar area while Spelling, Composition and Speech are modified more frequently. The majority of the teachers indicated there was a need for more supplementary material in all areas and eighty percent (80%) indicated that the supplementary materials in Grammar, Composition and Speech were inappropriate or non-existent.

Four teachers indicated there were no placement tests available in Language Arts; but that they utilized mastery tests at least once or more a week. The mastery tests are used to assign grades and assess mastery. All teachers indicated they did not use commercial or teacher-made skill checklists. When students fail a test, teachers indicated they repeat instruction or use alternative methods except in Spelling where they continue with list. All teachers indicated that they do not individualize. The sequence for instruction is determined by the curriculum guide, the text and some teacher judgement. Sixty percent (60%) of the teachers reported that they were basically unfamiliar with Language Arts in other grades. Forty percent (40%) indicated they were familiar with the program in other grades.

Observation

The students are grouped homogeneously with no evidence of small group work or individualization. The teachers seem to follow the guide and the text closely. It seems that the guide and text are used to meet student needs. Objectives are made clear to the students and are geared to large group instruction.

Interviews

The teachers (5) reported that classes are homogeneously grouped with little or no sub-grouping in the classroom. The curriculum guide, and the texts are followed closely for scope and sequence of instruction. The major content for Language Arts classes is grammar and spelling. The majority of the teachers indicated that the basic texts and supplementary material are inappropriate for their classes.

Questionnaires

All of the reading teachers reported that daily planning was guided by the teacher's manual and/or the district reading guide. Also, three (3) teachers reported they used their own reading plan. In the same fashion, the teachers reported that objectives are taken from teacher manuals or district plan. Three (3) teachers report using their own. All teachers indicated that they made students aware of instructional objectives and that the grouping for instruction was done by the office. Eighty percent (80%) of the teachers indicated that there was not a placement test with the basal and therefore no placement tests were administered. Twenty percent (20%) indicated there was a placement test and it was utilized.

Four (4) teachers reported that they test for student mastery 1 or more times a week and that the results were used for grading and assessing mastery. One (1) teacher assessed for mastery less than once a week. Forty percent (40%) of the teachers indicated they used a skills checklist or student profile to record mastery. Sixty percent (60%) used a combination of grade books, conferences, etc. Sixty percent (60%) of the teachers indicated they repeat the material when mastery is not achieved and none of the teachers regroup for instructional purposes. All teachers indicated they follow the sequence in the curriculum guide and basal text. Forty percent (40%) of the teachers indicated they were familiar with the reading program in other grades while sixty percent (60%) reported that they were unfamiliar with these programs.

The data indicates that all classes are homogeneously grouped by the office and that there is no grouping within the classroom. Teachers follow the district guide closely and test at least once a week for mastery. There does not seem to be a systematic way of recording skill mastery in the reading program. Knowledge of reading activities in other grades seems limited.

Structure (continued)

Reading

Observation

Students in the Middle School were homogeneously grouped and instruction was geared to the large group. There was no sub-grouping within the class and the instruction is deemed acceptable to all in the class. Generally, instructional objectives were made clear to the students and these objectives seem to be taken from the curriculum guide and teacher manuals.

Interviews

All the reading teachers report that they follow the curriculum guide and the basic text closely. They report they have few supplementary materials with which to work. Differences among the groups of students were managed generally by the teacher lowering expectations for average or slow groups.

Questionnaires

Eighty percent (80%) of Language Arts teachers spend at least 60% or more of the instructional time in teacher directed activity. The teachers reported a range of 5 to 20 students with whom they work individually each day. One teacher indicated that the information did not apply to his class. All teachers indicated they worked with students in grammar outside of class at least three times a week. The majority of teachers reported they also worked with students outside of class in the areas of spelling, composition and speech. However, this occurred once a week or less. All teachers (5) reported that there were student disruptions in class; but, it was a minor problem. Aides are not available in the Warwick Middle School.

Observation

Materials, activities and methods do not seem to change much from group to group. Drill is a common ingredient to most classes. The basic concern seems to be with lower level cognitive functioning, mostly recall. There was little evidence of application, transfer of knowledge or analysis.

Instructional Events

Reading 6 - 7 - 8

Questionnaires

All reading teachers reported they worked with students on reading skills outside of class less than three times a week. One (1) teacher indicated he never worked with reading problems outside of class. Sixty percent (60%) of the teachers indicated that eighty percent (80%) of the instructional time is spent with the total group. Sixty percent (60%) report they have minor problems with discipline and an interruption of instruction occurs less than once per class. One (1) teacher did not indicate the frequency of classroom disturbance because of discipline. All the teachers reported that they did not have aides for the classroom.

Observation

Generally, the teachers had knowledge in the content area. Drill was utilized often and the objectives were generally of a low cognitive level, mostly factual recall. There was little evidence of application or transfer of knowledge or analysis of information. Materials, activities and methods do not appear to change much from group to group; however, teacher expectations of students seem to change from group to group.

Appendix B-2

DEPARTMENT STRENGTHS (Teacher Interviews & Questionnaires)

1. There is a developmental reading program.
2. There is structure built into the new curriculum guide.
3. Using the sequence of writing from sentence to paragraph to longer efforts is positive.
4. The speech component of language arts is strong.
5. Students have two periods a day of language arts.
6. There is a sequence built into the new curriculum guide.
7. Grouping is a strength and a weakness.
8. There is a good student body at Warwick.
9. The program is well coordinated from K - 8.

DEPARTMENT WEAKNESSES (Teacher Interviews & Questionnaires)

1. There is a need to integrate language arts and reading.
2. Class sizes are too large; there is a need to sub-group.
3. There is no application or transfer of the skills learned.
4. There is not enough time or emphasis on writing.
5. There is no help for teachers in developing materials, methods, proper direction.
6. There is no articulation between reading and language arts.
7. There is no help for working with slower students.
8. We need a class set of some materials instead of a single copy.
9. We don't have a developmental reading program. Warwick has a literature program and grammar program.
10. We have insufficient materials for range of students.
11. Teachers do not meet together to solve problems.
12. Content teachers do not have sufficient strategies for Reading instruction.
13. The library should be used more effectively.
14. There is too much dependence on content in the curriculum guide.
15. There is too much emphasis on Grammar in the Middle School. Grammar, unfortunately, is an end product.

NEEDS SUMMARY CHART

PULSE VISIT	GENERAL NEEDS STATEMENT	STUDENT NEEDS	PROGRAM ANALYSIS
Little or no small group instruction. No individualization.	No small group activities.		No grouping for instruction
Student self management of learning activities is almost non-existent.	Students don't take responsibility for own learning activities.	Students do not apply reading skills in other areas.	No teacher-pupil planning
Little use of supplementary materials.	Lack of supplementary materials.		Limited range of and utilization of supp. materials.
Lack of communication across Language Arts/Reading staff.			Lack of coordination & communication bet. L.A. & Reading
No system for matching students and materials - this is a special problem in relation to lower level classes.	Student motivation is a problem - especially with lower groups.	Sixth grade reading is a problem area for lower level students. All language arts area need to be improved for lower level students.	Need for a management system.. Time-efficient - mater. students, skills, materials, recording skill mastery -
Most of classroom instruction is content/cognitive oriented. Limited use of IMC	Content oriented instruction	Students have problems in application level of skills mastered	Experience stealth in application of skills mastery. Poor application of skills Limited use of IMC.

Appendix B-3

-42-

APPENDIX C

SELECTION REFERENCES

Appendix C-1

Selection Criteria for School X

1. Clear Objectives
2. Appropriate Scope
3. Appropriate Grade/Difficulty Level
4. Varied Learning Activities
5. Pupil Information on Performance
6. Provision for Review
7. Extent of Individualization
8. Appropriate Cognitive Level
9. Provision for Staff Training
10. Organizational/Staff Changes Required
11. Local Acceptance

Appendix C-2

Outcomes Screened by LAT at School X

1. Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI)
2. A Systems Approach to Individualized Instruction (SAII)
3. Pegasus-Pace
4. Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT)
5. Positive Attitude Toward Learning (PATL)
6. Right To Read
7. Matteson Four-Dimensional Reading Program
8. New Adventure
9. Project R-3
10. Individualized Language Arts
11. Teacher Expectations Project
12. Reading/English Rotation Project

PROJECT EXEMPLARY CENTER FOR READING INSTRUCTION (ECRI)

descriptors

Teacher Education
Reading
Language Arts

target audience

Teachers who teach students of all abilities, grades K-12 and adults, mono- or multilingual, during reading and language arts instruction (including content reading), in suburban, urban, and rural areas and at all socioeconomic levels. Also for paraprofessionals, parents, and peers who tutor students at school or at home under supervision of teachers.

description

An inservice program for teachers of students at all ability levels in reading and language skills, with expectations of 95-100% mastery.

ECRI's original purposes in 1966 still exist: to identify critical teacher behavior essential to preventing reading failure, provide inservice education for teachers geared to the research findings, and disseminate this information. Teacher behaviors identified to date include abilities to: elicit correct responses from non-responding pupils, establish high mastery levels of responses with performance and rate as criteria, correlate language arts activities to increase responses and save time, utilize effective management and monitoring systems, and diagnose and prescribe instantly when errors or no responses occur. Techniques are incorporated into specific directives during reading, oral language, spelling, dictation, creative writing, and penmanship instruction. Student advancement depends upon rate of mastery.

A student progresses in practicing new skills and in working in materials independently of other students. No student waits for another. In small groups, based upon instructional reading levels, students are instructed in those language skills that they will need in future work. Individual conferences are held daily. Students are reminded of what skills they have been taught, what skills they mastered, and what skills they will be expected to master through the review (part of every skills instruction period). The teacher teaches new skills at least one mastery test in advance of the student who is passing the tests most rapidly, and reviews instruction for students at the lowest mastery test. Performance is individually measured with the mastery test. Absenteeism is not the problem it can be in the traditional classroom. No procedural changes need occur for a teacher to provide for the returning student. Students' attention is sustained with the momentum of the teacher directives during instruction and reinforcement offered during practice time. Overt responses help students remain on-task. The structure of the scheduling, record keeping, and multisensory instruction also keeps students motivated. Criteria for passing a mastery test are identical for all students, regardless of their reading levels. No student is made to feel less capable than another student. The teacher selects only those behavior-management techniques that build the student's self-concept, rather than destroy it. Instruction is provided by ECRI so teachers can utilize the critical teacher behaviors, develop the management system for mastery and individualization, and teach reading and language skills effectively.

assurances/claims

Project validated over three years (1971-74) with more than 700 pupils in four Utah districts. First graders reading at 3.8; second graders average 95th to 99th percentile; clinic pupils average four months' gain/month; Title I pupils average 1.4 to 3.2 years gains/year; secondary students average +2.5 years gains/year. Data available upon request. Some tests used: SAT, Metropolitan, California Achievement, Gates-MacGinitie.

implementation requirements

A five- to ten-day preparatory inservice education program with one ECRI staff person for 20-25 trainees is desirable. This includes lecture and practice sessions, preparation of materials for classroom use, and teaching pupils in a simulated setting. Following this, periodic visits by ECRI staff to trainees' classrooms to demonstrate, model, and monitor are desirable. The length of time to replicate the ECRI model varies. Existing district reading materials may be used. Supplies for teachers and pupils are those usually found in schools. ECRI has 16 self-instructional teacher-training workbooks and kits if inservice education is not desired.

financial requirements

At initial awareness sessions, time is provided without cost (travel expenses must be paid). For inservice programs and classroom monitoring, time and some travel expenses can be provided to a limited number of adopters. Some inservice and monitoring time is available without charge, but adopters pay all travel costs. Self-instructional workbooks $6.95 from ECRI. Mastery tests, 20¢ each; can be reproduced. ECRI staff time, $185/day plus expenses.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

A catalog of available materials and awareness materials available upon request. Visitors welcome (during school year), at sites throughout U.S. Week-long training seminars for teachers, supervisors, and administrators conducted quarterly in Salt Lake City and adopter districts. ECRI inservice also includes university classes (teachers pay tuition). Seminars for teachers of teachers conducted biannually. Three-week inservice program held each summer in Salt Lake City. A teacher-training internship program and a teacher-training exchange program with ECRI assist local districts and service centers to develop demonstration teachers.

contact Ethna R. Reid, Director; Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction; 2888 Highland Dr.; Salt Lake City, UT 84106. (801) 486-5083 or 278-2334.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-48 Approved: 5/23/74

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION (SAII)

descriptors

Basic Skills
Diagnostic Teaching
Individualized Instruction

target audience

Students of all abilities, grades 1-8.

description

A systematic instructional program in the basic skill areas of reading and mathematics.

SAII has developed criterion-referenced tests and learning modules for 155 reading skills, e.g., readiness, phonics, syllabication, and structural analysis, plus 200 criterion-referenced tests and learning modules for the computational skills of mathematics.

The project has also developed sets of teacher questions plus student worksheets to accompany over 400 paperback books, e.g., Profiles in Courage, Henry Huggins, Little Red Hen, etc. Each set of questions has been divided into lessons with each lesson having questions of five levels of comprehension: recall, interpretation, extrapolation, analysis, and evaluation. A set of two handbooks is available to help the teacher manage any of the component parts. The program can be adopted to the areas of diagnosis (criterion-referenced tests -- math and reading) or basic skill development (learning modules in reading and math, or comprehension components of reading).

assurances/claims

After implementation of the project, a dramatic reversal of a declining trend in academic ability at the project school occurred. Evaluation data also showed a positive impact on academic progress of project students. Copies of the evaluation report are available from Dr. Mark Greene, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

implementation requirements

A one- to three-day pre-adoption workshop is required. Consultant help is available at cost. SAII is implemented by the regular classroom teacher. The reading component requires two teachers, the math component one. Master tapes -- available for reproduction -- are also required for the reading component.

financial requirements

Print-ready set of project materials is available at cost. Diagnostic tests: reading, $16; math, $20. Learning modules: reading, $60; math, $110; comprehension questions, $150; games to accompany reading learning modules, $15.

services available

No special network funding supports this project's dissemination efforts.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome (October through March). Training is conducted at the project site (adopting site must cover all trainer costs as well as covering own costs). Training is conducted out-of-state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be paid).

contact Charles L. Barker; Josephine County School District; 706 N.W. "A" St.; Grants Pass, OR 97526. (503) 479-3321.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 15 Approved: 4/4-5/73

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT PEGASUS-PACE: Continuous Progress Reading Program: Personalized Educational Growth And Selective Utilization of Staff -- Personalized Approach to Continuous Education

descriptors

Developmental Reading
Continuous Progress Plan
Diagnostic Teaching

target audience

Kindergarten through junior high, all ability levels, English-speaking children. Originally approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel for K-6, the program now operates in K-8.

description

A locally-developed, personalized approach to continuous progress in reading -- a comprehensive developmental program.

Project PEGASUS-PACE seeks to accelerate students' reading achievement and to help teachers enhance their effectiveness through a locally-developed, personalized program of continuous learning. The curriculum structure consists of performance objectives and corresponding diagnostic instruments for seventeen sequential reading levels (K-8). Learners are grouped and sub-grouped according to their established needs; the personalized instruction employs a variety of approaches to the teaching of reading. Teachers conduct formative evaluation of specific skills and use a graphic chart to track each student's mastery at a given level.

Learning activities are selected or developed by the teachers in accordance with the diagnosed needs of the students. These activities and lesson plans are contributed to an accessible learning-resources file organized according to PEGASUS-PACE levels and skills.

The PEGASUS-PACE Continuous Progress Program is compatible with any organizational staff arrangement, such as open-space, non-graded, or self-contained classrooms. Teachers may continue to use any strategies they have found successful.

assurances/claims

In addition to meeting the core criteria for pre/post summative evaluation, assessed through a comprehensive evaluation design, the project met a large number of non-linear based objectives. Before project was developed, achievement scores of students at primary target school had shown a steady trend of regression. At end of third developmental year, more than 75% of students who had entered program as first graders scored at or above median of national norms.

implementation requirements

The program is implemented by classroom teachers, rather than special reading teachers. Some training is necessary both prior to and during implementation. Two-and-a-half-day workshops are offered prior to implementation. Adopter sites are expected to schedule released time on a regular basis for staff development. Adopter schools will be given permission to reproduce copyrighted materials. For all 17 levels, a Master Volume is available that contains: Objectives and Skills Check Sheet; Teacher's Guide and Key; Learner-Use Diagnostic Instrument. For levels 9-16, Learner-Use Answer Sheets are also included.

financial requirements

The Master Volume costs $40; the Trainer's Kit, $50. Reproduction costs have proven to be extremely low (between 40¢ and 80¢ per student per year). Cost of locally purchased file folders for Resource File, approximately $45. Locally purchased file folders for student records; cost varies with number of students.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Demonstrations, visitations, training workshops, and workshops for trainers of adopters are scheduled periodically in PEGASUS-PACE schools in Tuscaloosa. Project staff are available to attend out-of-state awareness conferences. Training is also available for potential out-of-state adopters at the adopter's site or at a Developer/Demonstrator approved alternative workshop site. Follow-up technical assistance is also available (expenses must be paid).

contact Marie Sinclair, Project Director; Tuscaloosa City Board of Education; 1100 - 21st St., East; Tuscaloosa, AL 35401. (205) 758-2323.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 1 Approved: 4/16/73

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT TEAMS-GAMES-TOURNAMENT (TGT)

descriptors Basic Skills
Games
Peer Teaching

target audience Pupils of all ability levels, grades 3-12.

description *An instructional method using cooperative teams and game tournaments to increase student learning of basic skills.*

Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) is an instructional method that reorganizes the classroom by dividing pupils into four- to five-member groups for study and peer-tutoring on worksheets. Individual group members then play instructional games against members of equal ability from other groups to score points for their teams. The TGT instructional method is appropriate for any curriculum unit (grades 3-12) that offers basic skills or factual information to heterogeneous groups.

Teachers may use only the TGT Teacher's Manual, or may include the worksheets and games already developed by the Center that cover specific instructional objectives. TGT is designed to supplement traditional lecture or drill methods, individualized instruction, or performance-based instruction. The TGT instructional process is carefully sequenced to enhance academic achievement, but teachers may adapt and change elements to meet certain objectives.

TGT curriculum units are designed for six to eight weeks' use in each class period, although shorter units may be completed in three to four weeks. The units help to improve basic skills, promote positive pupil attitudes toward schoolwork and classroom experiences, and increase cooperation through peer tutoring.

assurances/claims Ten experimental studies have demonstrated positive TGT effects on academic achievement in math and language arts. Each study employed a control group and pre- and posttest measures of standardized achievement, plus treatment-specific tests. Recent analyses have shown very positive TGT effects on classroom race-relations.

implementation requirements Individual teachers can implement TGT through use of teacher's manual and construction of own worksheets and games. For school or district implementation, there should be general awareness training, followed by workshop training (one half day). If TGT's published curriculum materials are used, no teacher development of materials is required.

financial requirements (1) Language Arts, grades 3-6, $110. Analogies Kit, grades 3-6, $51. Vocabulary Kit, grades 3-6, $75. Language Arts Kit, grades 7-9, $127.50. These kits contain all materials needed for a classroom of 30 students. (2) Materials (worksheets and game sheets) available for reproduction: Language Arts, grades 3-6: 100 objectives, $20; 20 usage objectives, $8. Mathematics, grades 3-6: 20 basic objectives per grade level, $8 per grade level.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness and training materials (brochure, teacher's manual, sample pack, and filmstrip) available. Awareness and adoption personnel are available from bases in New York, Maryland, North Carolina, Michigan, Kansas, Texas, Montana, and California.

contact John M. Hollifield; Center for Social Organization of Schools; 3505 N. Charles St.; Baltimore, MD 21218. (301) 366-3582.

Developmental Funding: National Institute of Education USOE JDRP No. 75-81 Approved: 12/18/75

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD LEARNING (PATL)

ILL-4

descriptors

Performance Based Education
Inservice Teacher Education
Self Concept

target audience

K-12 students with a less-than-positive view of self and/or learning.

description

A performance-based inservice training program designed to improve student attitudes toward school by strengthening the consistency of teacher behavior.

Improvement in a student's attitude toward school, self, and others leads to improvement in his/her rate of cognitive growth. Staff development is accomplished through the use of self-paced, individualized, performance-based learning packages called kits.

The teacher training kits teach specific skills in four complementary areas: (1) active involvement, (2) processes of learning, (3) individualized instruction, and (4) improved self-concept.

Each of the training kits is designed to provide teachers with performance-based objectives, numerous learning activities (designed to assist them in reaching those objectives), and criterion-referenced assessment procedures. Whenever possible, the learning activities provide the teacher with a choice of various media, small-group or individual sessions, and tapes or live observation. Feedback to the teacher is an essential component of the program.

Kit advisors, two per building, are trained to assist teachers working through the kits. Kit completion requires 20 hours of teacher time over a three- or four-month period.

assurances/claims

(1) Pre/Post Self-Concept Inventory: Target students improved from the fifteenth to the fortieth percentile. (2) Pre/Post Reading Comprehension Tests: Target students improved from .71 years of growth per year to 1.4.

implementation requirements

Four days of training for persons selected as inservice specialists or Kit Advisors. Each Kit Advisor can then work with from seven to ten fellow teachers, if they can be released from approximately 10% of their duties.

financial requirements

Start-up cost is $500 plus $10 for each teacher to be trained. Operational costs consist of stipends for inservice specialists.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Visitors are welcome by appointment every second week of the month. Training is conducted at the project site (adopting site pays only their own costs). Training is conducted out-of-state (exemplary project staff costs must be paid). Project staff may be able to attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be paid).

contact

Charles Pelan, Director or John Zirges, Inservice Specialist/Evaluator; Bethalto Unit #8 Schools; 322 East Central; Bethalto, IL 62010. (618) 377-5211.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 75-26 Approved: 5/16/75

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT RIGHT TO READ: Wilson Junior High School

descriptors

Content Reading
Diagnostic Teaching
Staff Improvement

target audience Pupils in junior high, middle, or high school.

description *An effort to eliminate illiteracy and turn kids on to reading.*

Right to Read differs from many previous attempts at solving reading problems. It is a process, not a program. It gets at causes, not symptoms. It requires commitment, not money.

Right to Read is a national effort to eliminate illiteracy and turn kids on to learning. It requires that users do a needs assessment to find out precisely what is needed; planning is based upon the needs assessment results. Implementation of the plan involves professional development with special emphasis on paid teacher writing time, so that teachers can work together to bring about change. Through sharing, teachers build upon each other's strengths, and find quicker and better solutions to their problems.

Woodrow Wilson Junior High (grades 7-9) draws from an urban area and is ethnically balanced. The major thrust is to encourage teachers to teach reading as it is related to their particular content area. Cross-age tutoring, community volunteers, and teacher assistants help increase reading efficiency at all levels of development. Students whose reading skills are particularly low attend special centers where they receive intensive individual attention.

Staff development -- taking the good teachers and making them into better -- is emphasized.

(Cited by the National Right to Read Effort as one of 12 exemplary reading programs.)

assurances/claims Evaluation data (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills) show that, over the six-month period between pre- and posttesting, the average growth in vocabulary was 11 months, or 1.8 months' growth for each month of instruction. In comprehension, the average growth was 18 months, or 3.0 months' growth for each month of instruction. The total reading score indicated that the average growth was 14 months, or 2.3 months for each month of instruction.

implementation requirements Adopter must be willing to reevaluate the cost effectiveness of current program. The Right to Read process gives direction to a school or system without sacrificing local autonomy. All financial decisions are made locally with respect to determined needs and priorities.

financial requirements Right to Read Assessment and Planning Handbook (available from your State Right to Read Director) and state-adopted and other commercially prepared materials covering a range of reading abilities and student interest have been utilized. Our own management system, with criterion-referenced objectives and teacher-developed tests, provides the basis for our diagnostic/prescriptive approach.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome by appointment. Training is conducted at the project or adopter site (adopting site must cover all trainer costs as well as own costs). Project staff can attend out-of-state conferences (expenses must be paid).

contact Valerie G. Russo, Program Coordinator; Right to Read; Woodrow Wilson Junior High; 3838 Orange Ave.; San Diego, CA 92105. (714) 280-1661, ext. 22.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-21 Approved: 3/25/74

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT MATTESON FOUR-DIMENSIONAL READING PROGRAM

descriptors

Reading
Performance Based Education
Individualized Instruction

target audience

Students of all abilities, grades 4-8. Comprehensive Reading Skill Development Program.

description

A multi-text individualized skills-developmental reading program for grades 4-8.

The goal of the program is that each student reaches a level in the reading-skills sequence commensurate with his/her reading expectancy level. The four dimensions are: (1) developing basic skills that students need in order to read critically, purposefully, and appreciatively; (2) teaching students to use reading as a tool for learning; (3) fostering an appreciation of literature; and (4) developing permanent interests in reading for enjoyment. Students progress through a series of individualized learning packages covering 108 behavioral objectives, omitting the skills they have already mastered. Activities noted on the learning packages direct the student to selections in various reading texts appropriate to his/her independent reading level. Activities are varied and increase in level of readability and complexity following Bloom's Taxonomy. Criterion-referenced tests provide teacher and student with specific knowledge of the skills that the student has learned as well as of the skills appropriate for instruction. Criterion-referenced tests consist of: placement test, pretest, posttests, and sub-skills tests for all 108 objectives. A management system, consisting of class record sheets and individual pupil-progress charts, shows the student's growth in reading.

This skills-development portion of the program is expected to take from 40-60% of the total reading time. The remainder of the time is devoted to application of skills through techniques of sustained silent reading, oral reading, and discussion groups which could utilize existing basal materials.

Adopters are trained in the use of cloze procedure, readability formulas, application of behavioral objectives, writing learning packages, diagnosis and placement of students, and program operation.

(The Matteson Program is intended to be a basic skills-development reading program. It is not a supplement to a basal reader series.)

assurances/claims

After three years in the program 80% of project group met or exceeded their reading expectancy level, while only 41% in control group met this criterion. The program group exceeded the control group by .63 on the Stanford Reading Achievement Test. Attitude toward reading significantly higher in program group, based on project-developed test.

implementation requirements

Most likely adoption is building unit; can be implemented in single classroom. No additional staffing is required. One or two staff from adopter district can be trained in two days; these, in turn, will train teachers of adopter. Project-developed set of Learning Cards and Mastery Tests are required materials along with one to three copies each of about 60 basal readers. These materials will accommodate a minimum of one classroom or a maximum of eight, depending on school organization. A small shelving unit for the texts and file containers for learning cards and tests are needed.

financial requirements

A set of project-developed and commercial reading texts costs approximately $800 and will accommodate up to 150 students depending upon school organization. Annual maintenance is minimal, requiring only replacement of worn books. Project materials cost $35 for set of Learning Packages, $15 for set of Mastery Tests, and $3 for Guide. One set of record sheets, placement test, and other materials for duplication are provided free with purchase of above.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Visitors welcome by appointment. Awareness and training sessions are available on- or off-site by arrangement. Materials are for sale through project.

contact

Allan Dornseif or Martha Carr; Matteson School District 162; 21244 Illinois St.; Matteson, IL 60443. (312) 748-0100.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 77-109 Approved: 2/25/77

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT NEW ADVENTURE: Success Strategies for Reading and Language [formerly New Adventure In Learning (NAIL)]

descriptors

Basic Skills
Individualized Instruction
Staff Improvement

target audience

Students of all abilities (K-6) and elementary school faculties.

description

Comprehensive early childhood language arts and classroom discipline.

This interdisciplinary program, emphasizing basic language and reading skills, trains regular classroom teachers to utilize diagnostic, prescriptive, and behavioral techniques more commonly used by reading clinicians and psychologists. Such newly developed approaches are combined with proven traditional methods to help teachers meet the wide range of pupil performance found in today's classrooms and remedial classes. Strategies useful for working with remedial, normal, and gifted students include: (1) ongoing teacher diagnosis of reading, language, and thinking skills; (2) special remediation of severe language deficits; (3) efficient classroom organization and management; (4) large-group, small-group, individual study; (5) attention to spoken vocabulary, psycholinguistics, reading, grammar, standard English, writing, social studies, and science; (6) a wholesome yet stimulating learning environment; (7) effective discipline.

This program combines individualized techniques for basal reader instruction, a systematic management system with learning activities that are motivating (yet appropriate for elementary-age children), a concern for academic achievement, and a concern for the child's self-concept.

Adoption may be for the total curriculum project or for 1 of 3 components of the program. Components available are: (1) Psycholinguistics, (2) Oral Language, and (3) Reading. Training for effective classroom discipline accompanies each component. A five-day seminar at the D/D site is available for training leadership teams from the adopter school system choosing total curriculum adoption. Seminars provide (1) in-depth training to prepare leadership teams for training classroom teachers, and (2) all training materials including instructional modules for each professional staff member, and an implementation/management kit. After training the D/D assists adopters with expanded training, planning, problem solving, and extensive materials to supplement initial training.

Training for school systems choosing a component adoption involves a two- or three-day workshop at the adopter site for either a faculty or a group of leaders who will train other teachers.

assurances/claims

Developmental research with approximately 1,000 K-3 pupils showed significant gains in reading, psycholinguistics, mental age, IQ measures, and attitudes toward school. In 1972, students in grades 1-5 averaged seven months below the national norm on CTBS -- Total Reading. In 1974, students in grades 1-5 averaged one month above norm for a gain of eight months.

implementation requirements

Component Adoptions: participation in two- or three-day workshops at adopter's local site (or central location). Total Curriculum Adoption: participation of a local trainer/coordinator in a five-day training seminar at D/D site. Three- to five-day total curriculum workshops available at adopter site upon request.

financial requirements

Initial training provided free. Materials charge: Component Adoption, $15 per teacher; Total Curriculum Adoption, $30 per teacher trained. Travel and per diem required for training workshop personnel, or for local person to travel to D/D center. Start-up costs for student materials, $0-$10 per child depending on what is already available at adopter site.

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Variety of awareness materials available. Project staff available for conferences (costs to be arranged). Visitors welcome by appointment. Two- to five-day training sessions conducted at adopter or D/D site.

contact June Johnson, Director; New Adventure; W. T. Moore Elementary School; Rt. 17; Dempsey Mayo Rd.; Tallahassee, FL 32308. (904) 877-8595.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-71 Approved: 5/23/74

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT PROJECT R-3: Readiness, Relevancy and Reinforcement

descriptors
Individualized Instruction
Heterogeneous Grouping
Cooperative Planning

target audience Students of all abilities, grades 7-9.

description *A motivational basic skills program that interrelates the reading and mathematics curricula through gaming/simulation activities involving career awareness.*

Project R-3 was jointly designed in 1967 by the San Jose Unified School District and the Education Systems Organization of Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, with the help of consultants from San Jose State University. It includes a curriculum that interrelates reading and mathematics with reinforcement through gaming/simulation, intensive involvement (a three-day study trip), parental involvement, and an inservice training program for staff development. The main objective of Project R-3 is the upgrading of essential reading and mathematics skills. By deeply involving the students in classroom games and simulations, the program seeks to motivate them to achieve in learning experiences; to make them ready to learn, to make learning relevant, and to reinforce positive attitudes and behavior.

The project utilizes the diagnostic/prescriptive individualized approach in reading and math. Reinforcement of skill areas is provided through gaming/simulation activities that involve team learning, the decision-making process, and developing career awareness.

(This project has been described in a Project Information Package.)

assurances/claims The overall reading achievement gain for 1972-73 on the CTBS, Form R, Level 3, exceeded normal expectations by three months. Per-month average gains were 1.4. The overall mathematics achievement gain for 1972-73 on CTBS was two years for eight months in the program. Highest gains were in Computation and Concepts (2.3 and 1.9). Lowest gain was in Math Application (1.3). An outside evaluator is contracted for both product and process evaluation.

implementation requirements Reading and mathematics teachers should have a knowledge of diagnostic/prescriptive approach to individualized instruction. Teachers must be receptive to team planning. All staff should develop expertise in gaming/simulation. Approximately 50 hours of inservice work is accomplished by each staff member in a given year.

financial requirements The basic materials of a reading program at the secondary level can be utilized. Special prepared math contracts cost approximately $150 for a complete set of masters to be duplicated. Other costs relate to gaming/simulation activities, contracts, and the cost of secondary instructional aides.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available at no charge. Visitors are welcome by appointment, at both project and demonstration sites. Training is conducted at the project site (adopter pays only own costs). Training may be conducted out-of-state (exemplary project staff costs may be paid for). Project staff may be able to attend out-of-state conferences (costs to be arranged).

contact Pauline E. Perazzo; 1638 Park Ave.; San Jose, CA 95126. (408) 287-1111 or 287-1112.

Developmental Funding: Variety of State and Federal Sources USOE JDRP No. 74-13 Approved: 2/20/74

Compiled Fall 1978

PROJECT INDIVIDUALIZED LANGUAGE ARTS: Diagnosis, Prescription, and Evaluation

NJ-5

descriptors

Writing
Basic Skills
Performance Based Education

target audience

All ability levels, grades 1-12, Language Arts, English, content-area classes; college basic skills programs; Adult Education programs; Special Education programs; independent or supplementary programs in written composition.

description

A project combining a language-experience approach with techniques derived from modern linguistic theory to enhance skills in written composition, grades 1-12.

At least three times a year, the teacher evaluates writing samples composed on self-selected topics by each student. Utilizing criteria common to nearly all language arts programs, he/she then is able to assign priorities to the needs of the class as a whole, of groups of students, and of individual youngsters. For each objective stemming from this diagnosis, a teacher's resource manual prescribes a variety of prescriptive writing or rewriting techniques for all content areas involving writing. Motivation for writing is strengthened by a "communication spiral" that links composition to the other language arts and to real-life experience. A record-keeping system permits the student, as well as teachers, administrators, and parents, to observe growth in writing proficiency from month to month and grade to grade. The program can be combined readily with pre-existing language arts curricula and objectives.

assurances/claims

Since 1970-71, evaluations at D/D site, in five consumer districts (urban, suburban, rural) in New Jersey, and one (suburban) in New York have consistently shown superior gains for project students (grades 1-7) in vocabulary, organization, grammatical correctness, spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure. (Data available.)

implementation requirements

(1) District must have a definite commitment to improving basic writing skills of all students. (2) District must be prepared to send initial cadre of teachers/administrators for two-day training in New Jersey (or elsewhere by arrangement), and to purchase copies of Teacher's Resource Manual and Management Manual (for administrators). (3) District must assume responsibility for extending program to other grades, classes, and/or schools in future years, with trained administrators conducting inservice programs. (4) District must report twice yearly to project (directly or through State Facilitator) on extent and quality of implementation.

financial requirements

(1) District must assume (or share with State Facilitator or NDN) the costs of releasing teachers and administrators for training workshops. (2) District must assume (or share with State Facilitator or NDN) per diem, travel, and lodging costs for project staff if training or awareness presentation is given outside of New Jersey. (3) District must purchase Teacher's Resource Manuals ($10/copy) and Management Manuals (estimated $2/copy).

services available

An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness presentations in New Jersey (elsewhere by arrangement). Awareness materials: filmstrip, $15; prospectus, $1; brochures free. Visitors welcome by appointment (10/15-6/15). Two-day training in New Jersey (elsewhere by arrangement). Follow-up consultations on-site in New Jersey (elsewhere by appointment) during first three years; consultative assistance thereafter regarding extensions of program within district. Assistance to consumer districts in supplying prototype evaluation designs and monitoring evaluations of student performance in writing.

contact Jeanette Alder, Project Director; Roosevelt School; Louise Pl.; Hoehawken, NJ 07087. (201) 865-2274.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title III USOE JDRP No. 74-55 Approved: 5/23/74

Compiled Fall 1978

PHILA-6

PROJECT: Teacher Expectations Project

phila-6

•DESCRIPTION

Research has previously established two things related to teacher expectations: (1) often teacher's expectations of their students can greatly affect their students academic achievement and (2) there are identifiable specific behaviors by which teachers convey appropriate or inappropriate expectations to students.

This project is a teacher training program in which (1) teachers experience through simulations the power of expectations to shape others behaviors, (2) learn through dydactic presentations input, research findings in this area and (3) through role playing practice important teacher behaviors which have been identified as conveying appropriate expectations to students and thereby facilitate learning.

Through self-monitoring devices teachers continue to practice work-shop learning in their classrooms for 15 weeks.

•TARGET AUDIENCE

Teachers of students K-12

•MATERIALS USED

Xeroxed articles
Xeroxed packets for teachers

•DESCRIPTORS

•FINANCIAL REQUIREMENT

Start up: for 10+ supervisory personnel
40 teachers
48 hrs. x 2 trainers x 15= $1440
12 hrs. x 2 trainers x 15= 360
$1800
+ travel and expenses

If teachers cannot use observation days or be released for inservice, per diem sub service for their release
(1 day x 40 teachers)($42)

Maintenance Costs:
1) Supervisory person, paid by district
2) Expendable materials, $3/person

•PROGRAM EVALUATION

In 1975-76 a controlled study was conducted with pre-post observations. Significantly greater increases were found for experimental teaching regarding quantity and distribution of identified behaviors.

•DEVELOPMENTAL COSTS

DEVELOPMENTAL COSTS

$65,000

ADOPTION CRITERIA:

1) Workshops are implemented by dissemination staff. One six hour, one two hour.

2) Supervisory-type personnel receive 2 days training.

3) Teachers submit minimum of 10 self-monitoring devices each to supervisory personnel.

4) Supervisors plan to run similar workshops in spring or following fall.

ADOPTION SERVICES:

•TRAINING MATERIALS

•DEMONSTRATION/ VISITATION

•TRAINING CAPABILITY

Three times a year.

CONTACT:

Earline Sloan
Affective Education Program
Room 323
21st and the Parkway
Board of Education
Philadelphia, PA 19103

(215) 299-7776

PROJECT READING/ENGLISH ROTATION PROJECT GA-5

descriptors Remedial Reading
Basic Skills
Communication Skills

target audience Grades 6-9.

description *A rotating classroom approach to teaching reading skills to students, grades 6-9. Not a "pull-out" model.*

To take into account the characteristics of the students and to meet the various individual needs identified, an organizational pattern was designed. Students are divided into small, flexible groups of six to ten, which move from station to station. Different materials and activities at each station are specifically planned to build a success pattern for the individual child. A rotation group consists of 60 children. Each group of 20 moves to three different classrooms during a two-period time block of one hour and 50 minutes. One classroom is equipped as a reading laboratory where basic reading skills are emphasized. A second classroom reinforces reading skills through various reading activities selected to provide sequential development of skills. In the third classroom, the English teacher again reinforces the reading skills through various English/reading skill exercises and through the language-experience approach to reading. This is a team-teaching approach that emphasizes the integration of the basic communication skills, as opposed to the "pull-out" model.

assurances/claims The mean gain for the 104 participants during FY 1972 was 1.3 years (Gates-MacGinitie). The average achievement prior to the project was 2.65 years in six years of schooling. Over a period of eight years participants have averaged one month's growth in reading per month of instruction as measured by standardized achievement tests.

implementation requirements Two state-paid teachers, one lead reading teacher (Title I), four paraprofessionals (Title I). This staffing equals one rotation and/or 60 students, which would equal three classrooms. Materials already in the schools are used.

financial requirements $4-$5 per student, excluding personnel.

services available An NDN-funded Developer/Demonstrator project.

Awareness materials are available. Visitors are welcome (October-April) by appointment. Regularly scheduled training programs are conducted at project site. Training is conducted out-of-state. Staff can attend out-of-state conferences.

contact Marcelyn Hobbs, Program Director; Reading/English Rotation Project; Norris School; McDuffie County Schools; Thomson, GA 30824. (404) 595-3527.

Developmental Funding: USOE ESEA Title I USOE JDRP No. 35 Approved: 4/4-5/73

Compiled Fall 1978